DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 607 EA 028 657

AUTHOR	Reed, Patricia; Smith, Michael; Beekley, Cynthia
TITLE	An Investigation of Principals' Leadership Orientations.
PUB DATE	1997-03-00
NOTE	46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

Effective school leadership requires an understanding of the tension between the technical and symbolic aspects of leadership. This paper presents findings of a study that examined principals' self-reported leadership orientations. A survey (the Principal Behavior Inventory) mailed to 865 secondary principals at Ohio public and private schools yielded 577 usable returns, almost a 68 percent response rate. Phase-two methods included interviews with six principals who had been classified as having "unfocused" orientations and observations at the six principals' schools. The term "unfocused" refers to principals' lack of emphasis on either the symbolic or technical nature of their responsibilities. "Unfocused" in this sense does not denote ineffectiveness. Findings support the premise that principals can be differentiated with respect to the emphasis they place on the symbolic and technical aspects of their work. The "unfocused" principals appeared to be more concerned with being accommodators, caretakers, collaborators, delegators, and facilitators. The majority of the six principals appeared to demonstrate a kind of "servant" leadership orientation, which emphasizes the professional relationship rather than the symbolic or technical qualities of the principalship. Overall, findings strongly support the use of the survey instrument as a reliable and valid instrument for identifying the importance that principals attach to different aspects of their work. Almost one-third of the survey sample indicated a bifocal leadership orientation; about one-fourth reported an unfocused orientation. Fifteen tables are included. Appendices contain the interview protocol and sample formulas. (Contains 23 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 607

An Investigation of Principals' Leadership Orientations

Presented by

Patricia Reed, Bowling Green State University
Michael Smith, Lourdes College
Cynthia Beekley, Bowling Green State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
Chicago, Illinois
March, 1997

EA 028 657

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Investigation of Principals' Leadership Orientations

Introduction

Background for the Study

Given that schools as organizations are unique moral enterprises characterized by a demand environment that constitutes regular and unpredictable threats to stability (Greenfield, 1995), what constitutes effective leadership in school settings remains a challenging area of study. Although recent developments in leadership theory are providing promising theoretical frameworks for identifying effective school leadership practices, leadership remains a complex and only partially understood phenomenon. However, mounting evidence points to the conclusion that effective school leadership requires an understanding of the paradox or tension between the technical and symbolic aspects of leadership and an acknowledgment of the importance of each in bringing order and meaning to schools as organizations and societal institutions.

The tension between the technical or managerial aspects of leadership and the moral or symbolic aspects of leadership has been the thrust a plethora of studies of school leadership since Burns' (1978) seminal analysis of political leadership which first introduced the concepts of transactional and transformative leadership. A fundamental issue emerging from these studies has centered around the question of whether, as Burns proposed, transactional and transformative leadership practices are distinctly different and constitute opposite poles of a leadership continuum.

Aviolio and Bass (1988) argued that both transactional and transformational leadership are necessary in schools. Transactional leadership is necessary for organizational maintenance and transformational leadership is necessary to stimulate change. Effective leadership is thus an inclusive rather than an exclusive concept which recognizes both the maintenance and change functions of schools as organizations. In keeping with this multi-faceted concept of effective

organizational leadership, Bolman and Deal (1991) argued that effective leadership is a function of the ability of individuals to view organizations from multiple perspectives and, subsequently, to exercise four forms of leadership: structural, human relations, political, and symbolic. The effective leader is one who carefully evaluates the situation and then exercises critical judgment in selecting the most appropriate form of leadership for that situation. Their later empirical examination of the actual nature of leadership, however, led these authors to conclude that most persons in leadership positions tend to rely upon only one, or at the most, two of these forms of leadership.

Some studies, such as those recently conducted by Leithwood (1994), do continue to lend some support to Burns' conception that transactional and transformational leadership are two distinctly different forms of leadership, one of which is ineffective and the other not. However, as Leithwood notes, more studies indicate that transactional practices are positive elements of a larger set of school leadership practices. As a consequence, Leithwood regards effective school leadership as an inclusive phenomenon which involves certain leadership practices having to do with purposes, people, structure, and culture.

Gardner's (1995b) recent examination of the nature of leadership also provides support for the conclusion that effective leadership is a multi-dimensional concept which may take the form of both direct and indirect leadership. Direct leadership is derived from technical expertise. Indirect leadership is reflective and evidences itself in symbolic products. Although Gardner considers the nature of the domain within which individuals exercise leadership as a significant factor in determining the effectiveness of direct (technical) as compared to indirect (symbolic) leadership, he emphasizes the need for leaders "to appreciate central paradoxes in the practice of leadership. . . . Leaders who would be effective in the future need to be able to communicate a more complex set of propositions: the tension between technical expertise that is

necessary for sound judgments and a concern for larger goals and values that can never be dictated by techne alone" (Gardner, 1995a, p. 34). A significant paradox in the practice of leadership is thus the "tension between the need for technical expertise-which requires sophisticated thinking-and the necessity for broad-based communication skills, so that one can reach the 'unschooled mind'" (Gardner, 1995b, p. 305).

The increasing emphasis upon the cultural, symbolic, and moral forms of leadership has led some to proclaim that the only really important thing leaders do is create effective organizational cultures (Schein, 1985). It has also contributed to the belief that management and leadership are two mutually exclusive constructs; managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). A growing interest in the symbolic and cultural aspects of leadership as they relate to organizational effectiveness has also permeated the study of school leadership. Numerous studies of school leadership have demonstrated the centrality of the role of the principal in shaping the school culture which, in turn, is a critical factor in determining the effectiveness of the school (e.g. Deal &Peterson, 1990; Sashkin & Walberg, 1993). And, like those who have examined leadership in non-education settings, Sergiovanni (1992) has contended that there has been an overemphasis on the technical-rational or managerial aspects of leadership and a lack of consideration of the heart of leadership which involves intuition, emotion, values and personal dreams.

This paradox created by the tension between technical expertise and the symbolic aspects of leadership to which Gardner refers seems particularly apparent in the domain of school leadership. Individuals who hold positions of school leadership, such as principals and superintendents, must be able to assure that schools are efficient and orderly. Yet, in education, there is a large "unschooled" audience which must be reached if schools are to create meaning and maintain their societal legitimacy as institutions (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995).

Empirical examinations of the extent to which school administrators demonstrate practices which exemplify recognition of the technical and symbolic aspects of their roles are as yet few in number. As Reitzig, (1994) noted, the most extensive practical examination of the tension between the exercise of technical and symbolic school leadership to date is that undertaken by Deal and Peterson and reported in their book *The Leadership Paradox: Balancing Logic and Artistry in the Schools* (Deal & Peterson, 1994). Using experiential accounts and portraits of school principals, Deal and Peterson attempted to describe what constitutes effective school leadership. They argued that effective leadership manifests itself in the form of practices that are based on the view that the many contradictions and polarities that characterize schools are complementary and balanced attention must be given to each. They contend that to be effective principals must be bifocal, giving balanced attention to both the technical and symbolic aspects of leadership.

Deal and Peterson's work is, of course, not without criticism both with respect to its basic assumptions as well as its methodology. For example, in conjunction with numerous criticisms pertaining to the lack of attention to aspects of leadership emerging from interpretivism and critical theory, Reitzig (1994), contended that, since all actions are symbolic, the leadership paradox presented by Deal and Peterson is a false one. Reitzig acknowledged that there are technical and symbolic dimensions of effective leadership but that these dimensions are intextricably linked. He agreed that Deal and Peterson's work can "help sensitize principals to the symbolic value embeddedness of their actions" (p. 526) but disagreed with the premise that leaders must consciously work at and learn to balance these two aspects of leadership.

Whatever may be the limitations of Deal and Peterson's work, their contention that most school principals are neither prepared to or learn to balance the symbolic and technical aspects

of their work deserves further investigation. Other than the experiential accounts upon which they based their conclusions, little empirical evidence still exists from which to determine if principals actually differ with respect to the extent to which they evidence a bifocal as compared to a symbolic or technical leadership orientation. Moreover, there is some limited evidence which suggests that principals may evidence other leadership orientations which do not reflect emphasis on either the symbolic or technical aspects of their work (Reed, Smith, Kasch, & Sanders, 1995). Further empirical investigation of the actual nature of leadership as it manifests itself in the leadership orientations of principals would thus seem to be warranted.

Purpose and Objectives

The primary purpose of the study reported in this paper was to continue investigation of the nature of school leadership as it is evidenced in the leadership orientations of principals. A previous study (Reed, Smith, Kasch, & Sanders, 1995) indicated that principals can be distinguished with respect to the extent to which they evidence a bifocal or balanced leadership orientation as compared to a technical or symbolic orientation. Results of that study also suggested the existence of a fourth or "unfocused" orientation. This paper presents the results of a second study involving a larger sample of building administrators. Specifically this paper presents the results of a study of principals' leadership orientations as indicated through analysis of 577 Ohio secondary school principals' responses to the Principal Behavior Inventory (PBI-P) and of interviews and observations conducted at the schools of six principals who, based on their responses to the PBI-P, were classified as having an unfocused orientation.

Method

Phase One of the Study

Participants. The target population for this study consisted of the 865 principals of Ohio public and private schools housing any combination of grade levels which included grades

ten through twelve. The final sample consisted of 67.7% (N=577) of this population. Of the 550 respondents who indicated whether their schools were public or private, 87.6% (N=482) were employed in public and 12.4% (N=68) in private schools. Of the 561 respondents who designated the location of their schools, 45.8% (N=257) were in rural settings, 35.8% (N=201) in suburban settings, and 18.4% ((N=013) in urban settings. Of the 574 respondents who indicated the grade levels housed in their buildings, 70.9% (N=407) headed buildings which housed grades 9-12, 16.9% (N=97) grades 7-12, and 12.2% (N=70) some other combination of grades which included grades 10-12. Of the 569 respondents who indicated the enrollments in their building, 39.2% (N=223) reported enrollments ranging from 501 to 1,000, 38.5% (N=219) reported enrollments of 500 or less, and 22.3% (N=127) reported enrollments of over 1,000 students. Of the 572 who indicated their gender, males comprised 85.0% (N=486) of the respondents and females 15.0% (N=86). Of those respondents who indicated their ethnic background, 95.6% (501) were White Caucasian, 3.8% (N=21) African American, .4% (N=2) Hispanic, and .2% (N=1) American Indian. None of the respondents identified their ethnic background as Asian American or Other.

Instrumentation. The instrumentation used in the first phase of this study was the Principal Behavior Inventory (PBI-P). The PBI-P is a self-report instrument designed to determine principals' role orientations as reflected in their educational beliefs, personal characteristics, and underlying reasons for engaging in common administrative behaviors. The PBI-P consists of three sections. The first section elicits demographic information, the second section states the directions for responding to the third section and offers three examples, the third section consists of 30 items, ten of which focus on the meaning principals attribute to their administrative behaviors, ten on the principals' educational beliefs, and ten on the principals' characteristics. Each item elicits two responses, one of which is technical and one of

which is symbolic in nature. Respondents are to indicate the extent to which each response accurately reflects their perceptions by using a 1-5 scale with 1 indicating low agreement and 5 indicating high agreement.

The content validity of the PBI-P was established through asking a panel of four experts, including the authors of The Leadership Paradox (1994), to review the PBI-P and assess how well each of the items in the third section represented the constructs of technical and symbolic leadership in terms of the eight roles associated with each of the two leadership orientations as identified by Deal And Peterson. Some revisions were made as a result of this review and, as a result of a second review, the panel of experts unanimously agreed that the items had validity with respect to representing the two constructs.

In the initial study utilizing this instrument, the reliability of the items was determined using Cronbach's *Coefficient Alpha* which yielded coefficients of .88 on the symbolic and .91 on the technical scales of the PBI-P. A similar reliability test was conducted using responses to the PBI-P obtained in this study and this test yielded coefficients of .89 for the symbolic and .88 for the technical scales of the instrument.

Data Collection. A listing of the names and addresses of all principals of public and private school buildings in Ohio housing any combination of grade levels which included grades 10-12 was obtained from the Ohio Department of Education. Copies of the PBI-P along with a letter requesting recipients to complete and return the instrument were then mailed to the 865 individuals included in this listing. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a second letter along with a copy of the PBI-P was sent to nonrespondents again requesting their participation. As indicated previously, a response rate of 67.7% (N=577) was obtained.

Phase Two of the Study

Participants. Prior to the implementation of this study, it was decided that the sample

for the second phase of the study would consist of six principals who, after analysis of responses to the PBI-P and calculation of strength factors for all respondents, were ranked among the 15 respondents having the strongest "unfocused" orientation as indicated by the strength factor calculation (see Appendix B for formula for calculating strength factors). Strength factors for the 15 principals having the strongest "unfocused" orientation ranged from 3.01 to 4.72. Of these fifteen principals, six principals who were as representative as possible of Ohio secondary principals with respect to certain demographic factors were then selected to comprise the final sample. The demographic factors considered included gender, school location, grade levels, and enrollments. Type of school was not considered since no private school principals were represented in the fifteen highest ranking "unfocused" principals. Five of the principals selected were male and one was female. Two of the schools headed by these six principals were in northwest Ohio, one in northeast Ohio, two in west central Ohio, and one in southwest Ohio. Two of the six schools were in rural settings, two in suburban settings, and two in urban settings. Five of the buildings housed grades 9-12 and one housed grades 7-12. Two schools had enrollments of less than 500, three had enrollments between 501 and 1000, and one had an enrollment of over 1000. These six principals were contacted by phone and asked if they would be willing to participate in the second phase of the study by being interviewed. All six indicated a willingness to do so. Approximately one hour was required to complete each interview.

Interview Procedures.

Interviews were scheduled and completed with all six principals within a period of two weeks. With one exception, all interviews were conducted on site in the principals' offices. One interview was conducted at a county office since the principal had changed positions shortly after completing the PBI-P. All interviews were conducted using a predetermined set of

questions (See Appendix A). All interviews were tape recorded and then transcribed verbatim for subsequent analysis.

Data Analysis

Phase One

The first step in the analysis of responses to the PBI-P involved conducting a correlational analysis to determine the reliability of the symbolic and technical scales of this instrument. Mean scores for the technical responses and the mean scores for the symbolic responses for all respondents were then calculated, transformed into *z* scores, and the means of all the *z* scores on each of the two scales determined. Respondents with standard scores above the mean on the technical scale and at or below the mean on the symbolic scale were classified as having a technical orientation. Respondents with standard scores above the mean on the symbolic scale but at or below the mean on the technical scale were classified as having a symbolic orientation. Respondents with standard scores above the mean on both scales were classified as having a bifocal orientation. Respondents with standard scores at or below the mean on both scales were classified as having an "unfocused" orientation (i.e., neither technical, symbolic, or bifocal). The strength of each respondent's orientation within each classification was then determined by calculating a "strength factor" and respondents in each classification ranked from "strongest" to "weakest" (see Appendix B).

Two-way ANOVAs were performed to determine if the technical and symbolic mean scores of those principals classified as having a bifocal orientation were significantly different from those having a symbolic, technical, or unfocused orientation. A similar procedure was used to compare principals classified as having a symbolic orientation with those classified as having a technical or unfocused orientation and to compare principals classified as having a technical orientation with those classified as having an unfocused orientation. Two-way ANOVAs

were also performed to determine whether there were significant differences on the symbolic and technical scales with respect to gender, school location (rural, urban or suburban), school type (public or private), school grade levels (7-12, 9-12, and other), student enrollment (0-500, 501-1000, over 1000), and years of administrative experience. Because so few respondents represented ethnic backgrounds other than White Caucasion, no comparisons could be made on that variable. Where significant differences were found, Tukey's Studentized Range Test was used to determine the source of those differences.

Finally contingency tables were constructed which indicated the number and percent of respondents in each orientation group in relation to each of the demographic variables. Chi-Square tests were then conducted to determine if there were significant differences across the four quadrants in relation to gender, school type, school location, school grade levels, and school enrollment.

Phase Two

The data analysis for Phase Two of this study was concerned primarily with determining if there are specific roles associated with an unfocused orientation that may be different from those associated with either a symbolic or technical orientation. The first step in the data analysis was to analyze the interview data to determine whether responses to the nine questions as well as any additional comments were indicative of the symbolic roles (historian, anthropological detective, visionary, symbol, potter, poet, actor, or healer) or technical roles (planner, resource allocator, coordinator, supervisor, disseminator of information, jurist, gatekeeper, and analyst) identified by Deal and Peterson. The second step was to analyze the interview data for the purpose of determining if the responses and additional comments were indicative of other roles which were neither symbolic nor technical in nature.

Initially, each of the three researchers analyzed the interview data independently. The

responses to each of the questions were first analyzed for the purpose of identifying reoccurring themes. Units of meaning which seemed indicative of any of the eight symbolic or technical roles identified by Deal and Peterson were excerpted and the specific role noted. Units of meaning which seemed indicative of roles other than those identified by Deal and Peterson were also excerpted and the nature of the role described. The entire transcript for each interview was then analyzed as a whole to determine if there were interrelationships between or among responses to the various questions and comments that were indicative of roles not revealed in the analysis of the individual questions. Once these independent analyses were completed, the three researchers collectively discussed and compared their independent findings and subsequently arrived at consensus regarding those roles which were represented in the data.

Findings

Phase One

As noted previously, the correlational analysis conducted on the two scales of the PBI-P resulted in Cronbach Alphas of .89 for the symbolic and .88 for the technical scales. The mean score for all respondents was 4.00 (S.D.=0.432) on the symbolic scale and 4.02 (S.D.=0.427) on the technical scale. The transformation of mean scores of respondents into *z* scores resulted in 31.0% (N=179) of the 577 respondents being classified as having a bifocal orientation, 19.4% (N=112) a symbolic orientation, 25.2% (N=145) a technical orientation, and about 24.4% (N=141) an unfocused orientation.

As can be noted in Table 1, comparisons of mean scores of responses to the symbolic scale of the PBI-P revealed significant differences between the mean scores of respondents in the bifocal and technical quadrants, the bifocal and unfocused quadrants, the symbolic and technical quadrants, and the symbolic and unfocused quadrants. No significant differences were found between the mean scores of respondents in the bifocal and symbolic quadrants or

respondents in the technical and unfocused quadrants.

Comparisons of mean scores of responses to the technical scale of the PBI-P revealed significant differences between the mean scores of respondents in the bifocal and symbolic quadrants, the bifocal and unfocused quadrants, the symbolic and technical quadrants, and the technical and unfocused quadrants. No significant differences were found in comparing the

Table 1.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Symbolic Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to Orientation

Orientation	n	M	p
Bifocal	179	4.413	
Symbolic	112	4.376	ns
Bifocal	179	4.413	
Technical	145	3.742	≤.05
Bifocal	179	4.413	
Unfocused	141	3.652	≤.05
Symbolic	112	4.376	
Technical	145	3.742	≤.05
Symbolic	112	4.376	
Unfocused	141	3.652	≤.05
Technical	459	3.742	
Unfocused	141	3.652	ns

bifocal and technical scales or the symbolic and unfocused scales (see Table 2).

Comparisons of mean scores of responses to the symbolic scale of the PBI-P with respect to gender revealed significant differences with females scoring higher on this scale than males (see Table 3). No significant differences with respect to gender were found on the technical scale (see Table 4).

With respect to school type, significant differences were found on both scales.

Respondents from private schools scored higher than those from public schools on the symbolic scale and lower than those from public schools on the technical scale (see Tables 5 and 6).

Table 2.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Technical Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to Orientation

Orientation	n	M	p
Bifocal	179	4.353	
Symbolic	112	3.606	≤.05
Bifocal	179	4.353	
Technical	145	4.301	ns
Bifocal	179	4.353	
Unfocused	141	3.666	≤.05
Symbolic	112	3.606	
Technical	145	4.301	≤.05
Symbolic	112	3.606	
Unfocused	141	3.666	ns
Technical	145	4.301	
Unfocused	141	3.666	≤.05

Table 3.

Comparison of Mean Scores of Responses to the Symbolic Scale in Relation to Gender

Gender	n	M	p
Female	86	4.253	
Male	861	3.962	≤.05

Comparisons of mean scores of responses to the symbolic scale revealed significant differences with respect to rural and suburban locations with respondents from suburban

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

locations scoring higher than those from rural locations. Significant differences were also found between respondents from rural and urban locations with those from urban locations scoring higher than those from rural locations. No significant differences were found between respondents from suburban and rural locations. On the technical scale significant differences were again found between the mean scores of respondents from rural and suburban locations and between rural and urban locations. In both instances, respondents from rural locations scored higher on this scale. Again, no significant differences were found between respondents from suburban and urban locations (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 4.

Comparison of Mean Scores of Responses to Technical Scale of PBI-P in Relation to Gender

Gender	n	M	p
Female	86	3.980	
Male	486	4.029	ns

Table 5.

Comparison of Mean Scores of Responses to Symbolic Scale of PBI-P in Relation to School Type

Type	n	M	p
Private	68	4.136	
Public	482	3.983	≤.05

Table 6.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to Technical Scale of PBI-P in Relation to School Type

Type	n	M	p
Private	68	3.721	
Public	482	4.064	≤.05

Table 7.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Symbolic Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Location

Location	n	M	p
Rural	257	3.960	
Suburban	201	4.037	≤.05
Rural	257	3.960	
Urban	103	4.016	≤05
Suburban	201	4.037	
Urban	103	4.016	ns

As can be noted in Table 9, significant differences were found on the symbolic scale between respondents from schools housing grades 7-12 and those housing grades 9-12 and schools housing other grades with those from schools housing grades 9-12 and other grades scoring higher on this scale. No significant differences were found between respondents from schools housing other combinations of grades and those housing grades 9-12. On the technical scale corresponding findings were obtained in that significant differences were found between respondents from schools housing grades 7-12 and schools housing grades 9-12 or other grades. However, in this case respondents from schools housing grades 7-12 scored higher.

Again, no significant differences were found between respondents from schools housing some other combination of grades and those from schools housing either grades 9-12 (see Table 10).

Table 8.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Technical Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Location

Location	n	M	p
Rural	257	4.003	
Suburban	201	3.956	≤.05
Rural	257	4.003	
Urban	103	3.981	≤05
Suburban	201	3.956	
Urban	103	3.981	ns

Table 9.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Symbolic Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Level

Level	n	M	p
7-12	97	3.923	
9-12	407	4.018	≤.05
7-12	97	3.923	
Other	64	3.961	≤.05
9-12	407	4.018	
Other	70	3.992	ns

Table 10.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Technical Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Level

Level	n	M	p
7-12	97	4.022	
9-12	407	3.980	≤.05
7-12	97	4.022	
Other	70	3.926	≤.05
9-12	407	3.979	
Other	70	3.926	ns

Comparisons in terms of school enrollments yielded significant differences on the symbolic scale between respondents from schools with 500 or less students and those from schools with over 1000 students with those from schools with over1000 students scoring higher. Significant differences were also found between respondents from schools housing from 501 to 1000 students and those from schools housing over1000 students with those from schools housing over 1000 students scoring higher. No significant differences were obtained when comparing respondents from schools with less than 500 students with those from schools with from 501 to 1000 students (see Tables 11 and 12).

Comparisons with respect to administrative experience yielded no significant differences on either scale.

Table 11.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to the Symbolic Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Enrollment

Enrollment	n	M	p
0-500	219	3.974	
501-1000	223	3.987	ns
0-500	219	3.974	
>1000	127	3.963	≤.05
501-1000	223	3.987	
>1000	127	3.963	≤.05

Table 12.

Comparisons of Mean Scores of Responses to theTechnical Scale of the PBI-P in Relation to School Enrollment

Enrollment	n	M	p
0-500	219	3.974	
501-1000	223	3.987	ns
0-500	219	3.974	
>1000	127	3.963	ns
501-1000	223	3.987	
>1000	127	3.963	ns

Results of comparisons of the number and percent of respondents in each of the four quadrants (bifocal, symbolic, technical, and unfocused in relation to the five demographic variables (gender, school type, school location, school enrollent, and school level) using Chi-square yielded significant differences with respect to gender (p≤.001), school type (p≤.001),

and school location ($p \leq .001$). No significant differences were found with respect to school enrollment or school level.

Table 13.

Number and Percent of Respondents in Each Orientation Quadrant in Relation to Gender

Orientation	Female	Male	Total
Bifocal			
Number	36	141	177
Percent	6.29	24.65	30.94
Row Percent	20.34	79.66	
Column Percent	41.86	29.01	
Symbolic			
Number	25	87	112
Percent	4.37	15.21	19.58
Row Percent	22.32	77.68	
Column Percent	29.07	17.90	
Technical			
Number	6	136	142
Percent	1.05	23.78	24.83
Row Percent	4.23	95.97	
Column Percent	6.98	27.98	
Unfocused			
Number	19	122	141
Percent	3.32	21.33	24.65
Row Percent	13.48	86.52	
Column Percent	22.09	25.10	
Total Number	86	861	572
Total Percent	15.03	84.97	100.00

The number and percent of respondents in each of the four quadrants with respect to gender are presented in Table 13. Of the female respondents 41.8% were classified as having a bifocal orientation while only 29.0% of the male respondents were classified accordingly. A greater percent of females (29.0%) than males (17.9%) were also classified as symbolic and,

in turn, a greater percent of males (27.9%) than females (6.98%) were classified as technical. However, the percent of females classified as unfocused (21.0%) was comparable to that of the percent of males (25.1%).

Table 14 presents results of comparisons of the number and percent of respondents in each of the four quadrants with respect to school type. A higher percent of respondents from public schools (32.7%) were classified as bifocal than were those from private schools (19.1%). A higher percent of respondents from private schools (47.0%) were classified as symbolic than were those from public schools (15.5%). And, a higher percent of respondents from public schools (27.3%) were classified as technical than those from private schools (8.8%). The percent of respondents classified as unfocused was comparable for both groups of respondents (25.0% and 24.8%).

As can be noted in Table 15, with respect to school location the percent of respondents classified as bifocal was very comparable for rural (31.5%), suburban (30.3%), and urban (33.9%) schools. However, the percent of respondents from rural schools classified as symbolic (11.6%) was considerably less than the percent of respondents from suburban (26.8%) and urban (26.2%) schools. The percent of respondents from rural schools classified as technical (29.9%) was considerably higher than the percent of respondents from suburban (19.4%) and urban (19.4%) schools. The percent of respondents in rural setting who were classified as unfocused (26.85%) was somewhat higher than the percent of those from urban settings (20.39%) but only slightly higher than the percent of those from suburban settings (23.28%).

Table 14.

Number and Percent of Respondents in Each Orientation Quadrant in Relation to School Type

Orientation	Private	Public	Total
Bifocal			
Number	13	157	170
Percent	2.36	28.55	30.91
Row Percent	7.65	92.35	
Column Percent	19.12	32.57	
Symbolic			
Number	32	75	107
Percent	5.82	13.64	19.45
Row Percent	29.91	70.09	
Column Percent	47.06	15.56	
Technical			
Number	6	132	138
Percent	1.09	24.00	25.09
Row Percent	4.35	95.65	
Column Percent	8.82	27.39	
Unfocused			
Number	17	118	135
Percent	3.09	21.45	24.55
Row Percent	12.59	87.41	
Column Percent	25.00	24.48	
Total Number	462	68	
	87.64	12.36	100.00

Table 15.

Number and Percent of Respondents in Each Orientation Quadrant in Relation to School Location

Orientation	Rural	Suburban	Urban	Total
Bifocal				
Number	81	61	35	177
Percent	14.44	10.87	6.24	31.55
Row Percent	45.76	34.46	19.77	
Column Percent	31.52	30.35	33.98	
Symbolic				
Number	30	54	27	111
Percent	5.35	9.63	4.81	19.79
Row Percent	27.03	48.65	24.32	
Column Percent	11.67	26.87	26.21	
Technical				
Number	77	39	20	136
Percent	13.73	6.95	3.57	24.24
Row Percent	56.62	28.68	14.71	
Column Percent	29.96	19.40	19.42	
Unfocused				
Number	69	47	21	137
Percent	12.30	8.38	3.74	24.42
Row Percent	50.36	34.31	15.33	
Column Percent	26.85	23.38	20.39	
Total Number	257	201	103	561
Total Percent	45.81	35.83	18.36	100.00

Phase Two

Themes in responses to individual questions. In responding to the question regarding the most positive features of their schools, five respondents cited various characteristics of the community as being among the most positive features of their schools. These included such characteristics as supportive families, the forthrightness of the townspeople, a belief in the importance of education, the continuity of "old families", and parent support for what occurred

in the school. Four of the respondents mentioned teachers as one of the most positive features of their buildings. Descriptors applied to teachers included terms such as "professional," "willing to try new things," "care about kids," and " a nice mix of staff experience."

When asked to indicate their major accomplishments, the responses of five principals were very diverse. One principal said "You have to recognize it's really not my major accomplishment, I mean, the money comes from the community and the Board of Education. My style is pretty much open. . . . I really believe in empowering the staff - if they want to do something, I'll try to help them." One pointed to his emphasis upon student recognition and another cited his efforts to integrate technology in the curriculum and to increase parent communication by initiating a freshman tea. A fourth spoke of nurturing other people's brilliance and expertise. A fifth cited his focus on academics and implementation of a staff organization plan that "works," and a sixth replied "healing the building."

When asked what changes in their school they would like to see, five of the six principals mentioned changes which were associated with economic conditions. Two emphasized the lack of adequate facilities (i.e., buildings) and one noted that use of monies from the general fund to make building repairs limited the monies that were available for teachers' salaries and instructional purposes. Three spoke of poverty within the community as a source of problems in meeting student needs. Two indicated that large enrollments either were or would soon become a problem. One spoke of the need for the community and the staff to become more accepting of diversity. One wanted to see more time spent on talking about student learning.

When asked why they performed certain functions, all six principals agreed that it was very important to tour the building. However, their reasons for doing this varied. Four principals indicated that their "visibility" was essential for the purpose of maintaining order and warding off or identifying problems. One said he toured the building to maintain its

appearance and eliminate graffiti, another to get to know the "kids" by name and get the "pulse and feeling" of the people, and a third to set the "tone" and let people know he cared.

Four of the principals agreed that it was very important to attend extra-curricular events. Three of these indicated that a major reason for attending was to avoid, identify and/or minimize problems. The fourth said he attended because parents expected to see him there. A fifth principal indicated that at one time he had thought that it was important to attend so that students would get the message that he cared. However, since six other administrators usually attended such events and the "reality of it is that we're there for management and PR," he no longer attended such events and did his " 'PR' in other ways." The sixth principal emphatically stated that he no longer attends athletic events because he does not think such activities should be under the province of the school. He said they not only involve too much time and money but, after such events, he found he spent all of his time on many Mondays resolving problems associated with these events and "not a second of time . . . on making the school better."

All six of the principals expressed certain reservations about the need for student assemblies. Four emphasized that assemblies should have an educational purpose. Four expressed concerns regarding "pep" assemblies which purportedly build school spirit. However, two spoke positively of having such assemblies as a means for developing school spirit and camaraderie. Three principals indicated that they had little responsibility for such activities and that either the student council or a committee was actually responsible for organizing school assemblies. However, one pointed out that he would "line up everything for them but I thought it was good to promote this through the Student Council . . .as something promoting values rather than their just organizing dances and that type of thing."

Five principals mentioned the expertise of the staff, particularly in the areas of curriculum and instruction, as a primary reason for seeking staff input. One commented, "I tell

the teachers . . . I'm not certified in those areas. Do a study and make what looks to be a sound recommendation and have support from professionals in the field. Go ahead." He acknowledged that this sometimes caused him problems when community members questioned curriculum changes that the staff supported. And he noted that "when I have to make a report to the school board . . . the teachers kind of melt in the background and I have to stand up." Two principals observed that staff involvement in their schools had led to staff taking over many functions which had previously been their responsibility thus lightening their workload and, in their opinion, often resulting in better decisions in various matters ranging from scheduling to organizing staff development programs. The sixth principal initially replied only that "you need to tap the resources collectively." Upon further questioning, he mentioned the existence of a building committee which he allowed to make some decisions and which he saw as a means for exchanging concerns. "It wasn't a total democracy, but if they had a concern, I listened. I didn't always have to agree."

Five of the principals said they used staff meetings primarily for informational purposes. One principal noted that he had a "cabinet" which addressed substantive issues. Another indicated that his staff was organized into six inter-departmental cross-age or experience committees which he scheduled to meet separately rather than schedule meetings of the entire staff as a single group. Two indicated they held staff meetings only if there was a particular purpose for doing so. One viewed staff meetings primarily as a means for faculty to "let off steam."

All six principals considered the interviewing of teacher applicants to be one of their most important responsibilities. The responses of four principals regarding their reasons for doing this included comments pertaining to assuring the applicants' "fit" with the students, teachers, and community. One indicated he was primarily concerned with ascertaining if the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

applicant "liked kids," could relate to people, and was a self-starter. Another said he wanted to assure that the applicant was "someone who doesn't have to be developed too much." He described this activity as "about the most important thing I do." Of the six principals interviewed, only one reported that teachers were regularly involved in interviewing applicants.

In responding to the question regarding communicating with parents, two of the principals emphasized the need to transmit accurate information and minimize transmission of disinformation as the major reason for communicating with parents. One spoke of the need to get support and understanding for what the school was doing and the problems the school was facing. Another viewed communication with parents as a means for identifying concerns and problems that needed to be addressed and emphasized that teachers needed to communicate more with parents on a regular basis, not just when problems arise. One admitted to having not done a very good job of communicating with parents in the past in that his communication had primarily been through newsletters that often became outdated before they were disseminated. However, he indicated he was now making an effort to meet with small groups of parents on a regular basis to gain their input on various matters.

When asked to cite their most positive leadership attributes, responses of the five principals typically mentioned personal characteristics and relationships with faculty and/or students. One principal described his major attributes as "giving people freedom, empowering faculty to do things . . . good interpersonal relations . . . gregarious, accessible, . . . don't get mad . . . don't jump to conclusions . . . walk the middle line." A second first replied that he didn't know. He then went on to describe his attributes as "likes kids . . . is no nonsense . . . doesn't believe in a lot of red tape . . . will stand up for the front line [teachers]." A third noted that he was not afraid of change nor afraid to try to implement change then added, "I want to do what's best for students. . . . believe in treating people with respect . . . am a good listener." A fourth

cited willingness to work, be involved and go down in the trenches with people. A fifth pointed to a willingness to respect and seek the expertise of staff and enthusiasm for trying new things. A sixth referred to his dream for the school as his major attribute. However, he qualified this by saying that although he knows what his goals are and is certain of how good he wants his school to be, he does not share his dream with others. He added that he knew he should outline his dreams for the school publicly but does not do this for "fear of failure, of never getting there."

Limitations cited by the six principals primarily centered around personal qualities and relationships with others. One principal noted that he was "impatient, sarcastic, up here-down there, no even keel, moody." One said he wasn't " polished" but added that if he were he would not have fit into the community. A third viewed his strongest attribute (giving people the freedom to develop, to experiment, and trying to empower the faculty to do things) as also his greatest weakness (letting things get out of control). A fourth principal indicated he was "horrible" at confronting others' shortcomings; instead he tried to work around, accommodate, and enable them. A fifth stated that she wasn't the "support person of the teachers" that she was "supposed to be". She also noted that she didn't do a very good job of prioritizing, sometimes made the wrong decisions, would prefer to put off making decisions until there was adequate time to think but often had to act and then recant. The sixth principal saw his major limitation as difficulty in keeping up on "all the new stuff coming out about learning."

All six principals seemed to have difficulty clearly articulating their leadership philosophies. However, the responses of all six principals had to do with relationships with others. One principal first replied that he had no leadership philosophy but then went on to say that it could probably be described as "hands off, democratic." One described his philosophy as informal in that he meets and discusses problems and solutions with his faculty council. He also said he believes in kids and in promoting and advertising what they do. Another described

himself as a conservative liberal who wants people to feel they can voice their opinions and have input and who sometimes allows collaboration but at the same time knows he has to take the consequences of decisions regardless of who makes them. He concluded by saying he was "sometimes democratic." A fourth said, "My goal is to try to get the group to the best possible position that I can get and deal with everybody when I walk out of here and say thank you on the way out." A fifth said it depends on the situation but also added that he had a non confrontational philosophy. The sixth principal said his philosophy was to "encourage staff members to be the best they can be and expect them to."

Three of the six principals considered their philosophy to be a good fit with that of the superintendent. Two thought their philosophy was at odds with that of the superintendent. Two thought the fit was good with the majority of their staff. One thought his "hands off, democratic" philosophy was accepted by the staff when it was applied to them individually but that faculty members didn't like that philosophy when it meant others were accorded certain freedoms." One principal did not comment on the fit with staff. Another spoke at length about various experiences entailing relationshis with the superintendent and the staff but never responded directly to the question.

When asked what they would most like to have said about them when they leave their positions as principals, four wanted others to think well of them. One replied, "I don't know. You cared about me. The kids, you know. I never thought about what teachers would think about me. . . Probably prefer the kids and the parents think he cared about me. . . . [This district] has had very few principals and very few superintendents. . . . These guys did the job for 35 and 40 years. I would hope that they would compare me favorably to the guys that came before me." A second (who had taken a new position) spoke of the fact that when he left his position as principal he thought that people in the community all sensed "that I tried to do what was best . . .

that I had a moral conviction as to what education was and what appropriate behavior was even if they didn't agree with every decision I made." A third wanted others to say he "worked hard, was fair." A fourth replied, "That I made people feel appreciated and respected for their abilities - whether they were classroom teachers or a cook or a custodian - that lifted them up so that they could feel good about what they did." Three also spoke of what they wanted their school to be like. One said, "That under my leadership we were able to initiate some new programs to help students." Another wanted people to say, "It's better than it was. That he left the school better than it was when he got here. That would be the most important thing." A third noted "I would most like them to say that he helped create an atmosphere, freedom to learn."

Symbolic roles reflected in responses. Of the eight symbolic roles identified by Deal and Peterson (1991), only one role was represented in the responses of the majority of the six principals. This was the role of acting as a symbol; that is, one who attempts to affirm values through demeanor, behavior, concerns, attention, and routines. This role was one to which the principals most commonly alluded in giving their reasons for touring the building, attending extracurricular events, and holding assemblies. Values these principals appeared to be attempting to affirm by being visible within and without the school were primarily those of order, stability, and caring.

Responses of three of the principals suggested that they were acting as potters, that is, trying to shape the school culture through highlighting school heroes and heroines and creating or maintaining traditions and rituals that they considered important in shaping the values, norms, and beliefs of students, staff, and community members. Allusions to this role appeared primarily in comments regarding touring the building, holding assemblies, and interviewing teacher applicants.

Three principals also appeared to be taking on the role of healer. One actually stated that

his major accomplishment was "healing the building." Two others spoke of major changes and transitions in the life of the school and their concerns regarding holding people together and overcoming the losses or problems associated with these transitions.

Although three of the principals spoke at length about happenings in their schools or communities, only one made any comments relating to the role of historian and using past happenings to try to understand and help others understand what is "really going on" (Deal and Peterson, 1994, p. 29) in the present life of the school. These comments were made in conjunction with describing the changing demographics of the school over the past several years.

Five of the six principals gave no indication of having or communicating any clear visions of what they wanted their schools to become. The one principal who mentioned his dream for the school as his major attribute did not indicate the nature of that dream and admitted he did not communicate that dream publically. One principal briefly referred to one of the goals set forth in the school mission statement that was displayed in the school office when discussing his reasons for holding school assemblies. Another mentioned his commitment to maintaining a "comprehensive high school" which met the needs of a diverse student population when commenting on the importance of extra-curricular events. A fourth noted that one of his major accomplishments had been that of focusing the school on academics but made no reference to what he wanted to accomplish in the future. Two spoke of their desire to make the school better but did not indicate what that entailed. None of the principals mentioned any underriding purposes or goals which they thought should or did provide direction for their schools. And, when asked what changes they would like to see in their schools, all but one talked only about limited funding and economic conditions within the community that created problems for the school.

Symbolic roles not represented in the comments of most of the principals were those of

anthropological detective, poet, and actor. Only one principal alluded to the role of anthropoligical detective when he described an instance in which he had attempted to ask teachers to reflect upon the reasons why they were adamant about maintaining certain rules and requirements. The other principals appeared to accept most routines and rituals as "givens." The six principals' comments also gave no indication that they were sensitive to the importance of the informal network of "key" players which exists apart from the formal structure in schools.

While all told stories about their schools during the interviews, most of these stories did not give any indication that the majority of the principals used stories, metaphors, or slogans to reinforce values and communicate beliefs. In the interviews, most of the stories were told to describe various types of problems. Only one principal told stories as a way of communicating his beliefs regarding the importance of maintaining a clean building and showing respect for property.

The six principals' comments also gave very little indication that they played a key role in "orchestrating" either the predictable or unpredictable dramas which characterized their schools. When they described various dramas or events within their schools, they portrayed themselves only as actors within these events, not orchestrators of these ongoing dramas. And they typically spoke of dramas which involved conflict as inhibiting and nonproductive rather than as potentially productive.

Technical roles reflected in responses. Only two of the eight technical roles identified by Deal and Peterson (1991) were commonly reflected in the comments of the six principals. These were the roles of gatekeeper and disseminator of information.

The role of gatekeeper was reflected in the comments of all six principals. The aspect of their work in which gatekeeping was consistently referred to was that of assuring that proper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

candidates were selected for teaching positions. Their primary gatekeeping concern was that candidates would "fit in," had the "right" personality, and liked "kids."

All acknowledged that they served as disseminators of information in relation to broadcasting accomplishments of the school to external constituencies. However, only one principal gave any indication of trying to assure that community representatives were involved in planning and other important schoolwide decisions. Only two principals referred to the need to use multiple channels for keeping everyone informed. All emphasized the importance of informal contacts with school staff and other stakeholders as a means of communication.

Two of the principals talked of their role as supervisors but both admitted to being reluctant to confront poor performance. Four made no mention of actively monitoring the work of staff to assure quality or of distributing sanctions or rewards relating to staff performance. The two that mentioned the role of supervisor admitted to having discomfort with this role.

None of the six principals interviewed made references to the technical roles of planner, resource allocator, coordinator, jurist or analyst. None appeared to assume major responsibility for planning with respect to setting or operationalizing goals, making sure everyone knew where the school was headed, developing action plans, or evaluating progress. In fact, comments of three of the principals indicated that many of these functions were primarily the responsibility of various committees.

While all of the principals repeatedly referred to the scarcity of resources, none gave any indication of playing a major role in determining where resources where most needed to maximize progress toward instructional outcomes and assuring that resources were distributed rationally. Those principals who did refer to the allocation of resources within their schools consistently noted that faculty were given primary responsibility for making these decisions.

Only one principal made a comment relating to job interrelatedness and the need for an

appropriate blend of vertical and horizontal linkages. Most of these principals seemed to prefer to operate on a one-to-one basis with staff as well as view various groups (departments, classified staff, support staff, parents, and students) as being discrete rather than related domains.

All of the principals spoke repeatedly of various types of situations involving conflicts with students, staff, or community members but appeared to be more concerned with avoiding situations which might entail conflict than developing systematic procedures for identifying and resolving emerging or existing conflicts. Only one gave an example of an attempt to gather facts and use logic to analyzie a situation so as to arrive at what appeared to be the best solution. All the principals made reference to being besieged with a multiplicity of immediate problems on a day-to-day basis and several referred to the difficulties in making decisions without adequate time to arrive at the best solution.

Other roles reflected in responses. Various behaviors, characteristics, and/or beliefs which emerged in the comments of the six principals suggested that the majority of the principals interviewed tended to emphasize certain roles and functions that are not representative of either a symbolic or technical orientation. While all these behaviors, characteristics, and beliefs were not represented in the comments of all six principals, all were represented in the comments of a majority of the principals. These behaviors, characteristics, and/or beliefs were categorized by the researchers as being representative of eleven related roles and associated functions. Listed below are these eleven roles along with a brief descriptor of the type of function associated with each of these roles.

Caretaker - one who affirms others

Collaborator - one who works with others

Compromisor - one who reaches agreement with others by mutual concession

Conflict Avoider - one who shuns disagreement with or among others

Delegator - one who assigns authority to others

Empowerer - one who gives freedom and responsibility to others

Facilitator - one who makes it easier for others to get things done.

Helper - one who gives assistance and support to others

Nurturer - one who promotes the development of others

Supporter - one who follows or backs others

When considered as a whole, it can be seen that all of these eleven roles and associated functions have to do with establishing certain types of relationships with others.

Discussion

Demographic Considerations

With respect to the demographic variables addressed in this study, the finding which indicates that female secondary principals may be more symbolic than male secondary principals with respect to leadership orientation is not surprising in that it is consistent with other research findings which have revealed similar types of differences in the ways women and men lead (Eagly & Johnson, 1991; Rosenor, 1990). More provacative may be the finding which indicates that female and male secondary principals do not differ with respect to the emphasis they place on the technical aspects of their work and the finding that a greater percentage of female than male secondary principals evidence a bifocal orientation. Such findings imply that female secondary principals are no more apt to neglect their technical roles that male principals but that male secondary principals are more likely to neglect the symbolic aspects of their work. Also, if there is a positive correlation between bifocalism and being a more effective principal, then the findings suggest that there may be more effective female secondary principals than there are effective male secondary principals. This would be

consistent with Shakeshaft's (1987) assertion that "academic achievement if higher in schools and districts in which women are administrators (p.197).

With respect to school type, the finding that, as a group, private school principals have a greater tendency to emphasize the symbolic aspects of their work while public school principals have a greater tendency to emphasize the technical aspects of their work may be associated with a more specific focus on the part of most private as compared to public schools. Private school principals may more clearly recognize the need to provide symbolic leadership in that their schools have a more clearly defined mission than do public schools which are expected to serve many diverse and often conflicting purposes.

Some related patterns seem to characterize the comparisons of secondary principals' leadership orientations in terms of school location, type, and grade level. Principals of rural secondary schools appear to be more likely to emphasize the technical aspects of their work than their cohorts in urban or suburban schools. Principals in schools housing grades 7-12 (more typically in rural or small city settings) also appear to emphasize the technical aspects of their work to a greater extent than do their cohorts in schools housing grades 9-12 or schools housing other combination of grades including 10-12. Principals of secondary schools with enrollments below 1000 (also more typically in rural or small city settings) also appear to be more technically oriented that principals of larger schools. A possible factor which might in part account for these differences may be that principals in rural, small schools housing grades 7-12 often have no administrative assistance and thus find themselves more compelled to focus upon the technical aspects of their work. It should be noted, however, that there is little variation among the proportion of principals classified as bifocal with respect to the variables of school location, size, or enrollment. Thus, it would appear that these demographic variables are not instrumental in explaining why some secondary principals, regardless of school

location, size, and grade levels, place higher emphasis upon both the symbolic and technical aspects of their work.

Principals' Leadership Orientations

Findings of this study lend further support to the premise that principals can be differentiated with respect to the emphasis they place upon the symbolic and technical aspects of their work. Both this and the earlier study conducted by Reed, Smith, Kasch, & Sanders (1995) indicate that principals who were classified as bifocal place significantly more emphasis upon the symbolic aspects of their work than do those classified as technical and unfocused principals. Both studies also indicate that "bifocal" principals place significantly more emphasis upon the technical aspects of their work than do "symbolic" and "unfocused" principals. However, results of this study indicate that "bifocal" principals cannot be differentiated from "symbolic" principals with respect to the emphasis placed upon the symbolic aspects of their work nor can they be differentiated from "technical" principals with respect to the emphasis placed upon the technical aspects of their work.

Findings of this study also indicate that "symbolic" principals place more emphasis upon the symbolic aspects of their work than do either "technical" or "unfocused" principals. However, "symbolic" principals cannot be differentiated from "unfocused" principals with respect to the emphasis placed upon the technical aspects of their work. Similarly, "technical" principals place more emphasis upon the technical aspects of their work than do either "symbolic" or "unfocused" principals but "technical" principals cannot be differentiated from their "unfocused" counterparts with respect to the emphasis placed upon the symbolic aspects of their work. Thus it would appear that "bifocal" and "symbolic" principals are comparable in that they both give considerable attention to the symbolic aspects of their work and "bifocal" and "technical" principals are comparable in that they both given considerable attention to the

technical aspects of their work. Moreover, "symbolic" and "unfocused" principals are comparable in that they both give minimal attention to technical aspects of their work and "technical" and "unfocused" principals are comparable in that they both give minimal attention to the symbolic aspects of their work. "Unfocused" principals, however, appear to give minimal attention to either the symbolic or technical aspects of their work.

That "unfocused" principals give minimal attention to both the symbolic and technical aspects of their work is supported by the findings of the second phase of the study. While some of the six principals interviewed appeared to emphasize some symbolic functions, only one symbolic role surfaced repeatedly in the comments of the six principals. With respect to technical functions, only two of the eight functions considered surfaced repeatedly in the responses of the six principals. Moreover, in discussing other technical functions, most of the principals noted that many of these functions were being assumed by other staff members.

Findings of Phase 2 of the study thus lend additional support to the findings of Phase I of the study which indicated that the "unfocused" principals place very little emphasis upon either the symblic or technical aspects of their work. Findings from Phase 2 also suggest that principals who are classified as highly "unfocused" may well have abdicated their roles as either symbolic or technical leaders. Instead it would appear that such principals may be much more concerned with being accommodators, caretakers collaborators, compromisors, conflict avoiders, delegators, empowerers, facilitators, helpers, nurturers, and/or supporters. Using Leithwood's (1994) rubric of transformational leadership behaviors, this may imply that "unfocused" principals are highly concerned with people but only minimally concerned with purposes, structure, or culture.

Of interest also are a number of related findings. The six "unfocused" principals interviewed in this study seemed to measure their own worth more in terms of what others

thought of them than in terms of their accomplishments as they related to the mission of the school. They seemed to measure the worth of their schools more in terms of whether it provided a caring, stable, and orderly environment rather than in terms of who well it was achieving its mission. They appeared to be followers (though sometimes reluctantly) or reactors more than direction setters or leaders.

In summary, the majority of the "unfocused" principals interviewed in this study might well be characterized as evidencing a leadership orientation more suggestive of the concept of "servant leader" described in the work of De Pree (1989) rather than evidencing any of the three leadership orientations described by Deal and Peterson (1994). This leadership orientation might be characterized as one which emphasizes the relationship rather than the symbolic or technical aspects of the work of the principalship.

Summary

Overall, results of this study strongly support the use of the PBI-P as a reliable and valid instrument for identifying principals' tendencies regarding the importance they attach to the symbolic and technical aspects of their work. Moreoever, if bifocal leadership on the part of principals, as Deal and Peterson (1994) contended but as yet remains empirically unsubstantiated, is an indicator of effectiveness, it is encouraging to note that almost one-third of Ohio's secondary principals appear to be bifocal in their leadership orientations. However, it is also pertinent to note that about one-fourth appear to be unfocused, thus suggesting that a considerable number of Ohio secondary principal may be giving minimal attention to both the symbolic and technical aspects of leadership.

Based on the dimensions of leadership (symbolic and technical) measured by the PBI-P, the term "unfocused" appears to be an appropriate term for classifying certain principals so long as it is understood that this term refers to their lack of emphasis upon either the symbolic

or technical aspects of their work. The results of this study also suggest that certain commonalities may exist among principals classified as "unfocused" with respect to their emphasizing other aspects of their work which are primarily relational, rather than symbolic or technical, in nature. Through emphasizing the relationship aspects of their work, some "unfocused" principals may well be evidencing a type of leadership orientation which promotes schoolwide leadership through recognizing and tapping the individual resources of others who may, in turn, provide symbolic and technical leadership. The term "unfocused" should therefore not be interpreted to mean that such principals do not emphasize any aspects of leadership or imply that they are necessarily "ineffective."

Interpretation of the findings of the second phase of this study must, however, at this time be viewed with caution for several reasons. Two principals within the small sub-sample of "unfocused" principals appeared not to be strongly relationship orientated. Thus an unfocused orientation as determined through administration of the PBI-P cannot at this point be said to reveal the existence of a relationship orientation. Furthermore, since the sample used in this study was limited to principals classified as unfocused, there is no comparative data from which to determine the extent to which principals classified as bifocal, symbolic, or technical may also emphasize relationship aspects of their work. Also, since this sample was deliberately selected and known by the researchers to consist only of principals classified as unfocused on the basis of their responses to the PBI-P, bias on the part of the researchers could have affected the analysis of the interview data.

Further study not only of those principals classified as unfocused but those classified as bifocal, symbolic, or technical with respect to the emphasis they place upon the relational aspects of leadership is needed. In future studies, the possible effects of researcher bias which could affect the data analysis should be minimized by assuring that classification of subjects on

the basis of results of the PBI-P is not known to the interviewers or those who analyze the interview data. Such a study is currently planned. Should subsequent research substantiate the findings of this study with respect to the existence of a relationship leadership orientation in addition to the existence of a symbolic and technical orientation, the theoretical framework used in designing the PBI-P will need to be revisited and the instrument revised to address this additional orientation.

Possible linkages between principals' leadership orientations and school effectiveness also need to be investigated. One such study which will examine possible relationships between the orientations of secondary school principals and school effectiveness as evidenced by students' scores on the Ohio Proficiency Examination is also planned. Additionally, studies such as that conducted by Roberts (1996) having to do with the nature of leadership throughout the school rather than just the leadership exercised by the building administrator, would seem to be justified in that the nature of leadership throughout the school rather than just that of the principal may well be a stronger predictor of school effectiveness.

References

Aviolio, B., & Bass, B. (1988). Transformational leadership: Charisma and beyond. In J. Hunt, B. Baliga, H. Dachler, & C. Shriesheim (Eds.), Emerging leadership vistas (pp. 29-49) Toronto: Lexington Books.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Bolman, L .G. & Deal, T. E. (1992). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice & leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Deal, T. E. & Peterson, K. D. (1990). The principal's role in shaping school culture. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Deal, T. E. & Peterson, K. D. (1994). The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Pree, M. (1989). Leadership is an art. New York: Doubleday.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 233-256.

Gardner, H. (1995a, September 13). A cognitive view of leadership. Education Week, pp. 34-35.

Gardner, H. (1995b). Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership. New York: Basic Books.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 61-85.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). The change masters: Innovation and entrepreneurship in the American corporation. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 498-518.

Ogawa, R. T. & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31, 224-243.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Reed, P. L., Smith, M., Kasch, A., & Sanders, E. T. W. (1995, October). An investigation of principals' leadership orientations. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Convention, Salt Lake City, UT.

Reitzig, U. C. (1994). [Review of the book The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools]. Educational Administration Quarterly, 30, 525-530.

Roberts, A.K. (1996). A study of title I schoolwide grant projects and the leadership orientation of the elementary principal. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

Rosenor, J. (1990). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 68, 119-125.

Sashkin, M. & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Educational leadership and school culture. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. What do you think are the two or three most positive features of your school?

2. What do you consider to be your major accomplishment since becoming the principal of this school?

3. What two things about your school would you most like to change?

4. On the questionnaire, you were asked to indicate the extent to which certain specific responses reflected your reasons for engaging in certain activities. I'd like to name a few of the activities that were included and ask you now to tell me the main reason or reasons why you do these things:

   a. Tour the building
   b. Attend extra-curricular activities
   c. Hold school assemblies
   d. Seek input from staff
   e. Hold staff meetings
   f. Interview teacher applicants
   g. Communicate with parents.

5. What do you consider to be your two or three strongest leadership attributes? What do you consider to be your limitations?

6. How do you think your staff would answer that last question?

7. How would you summarize your leadership philosophy? How well does your philosophy "fit" the expectations of your staff and the central administration?

8. When you leave your position as principal of this school, what would you most like people to say about you?

9. Finally, is there anything you particularly want to say about your role as the designated building leader that you haven't had the opportunity to say?

Appendix B

FORMULA FOR STRENGTH FACTOR CALCULATION

Bifocal Strength Factor = Symbolic *z* score + Technical *z* score

Symbolic Strength Factor = (Symbolic *z* score - Technical *z* score) + Symbolic *z* score

Technical Strength Factor = (Technical *z* score - Symbolic *z* score) + Technical *z* score

Unfocused Strength Factor = (Symbolic *z* score + Technical *z* score) x -1